



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Hugh)	Examiner: Marcin R. Filipczyk
Harnsberger and Anne Osborn)	
)	Group Art Unit: 2161
Application No.:10/723,018)	
)	
Filing Date: November 26, 2003)	Docket No. 12382.0018
For: An Electronic Clinical Reference)	
and Education System and Method of)	
Use)	

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED OCTOBER 4, 2007

Remarks

In the Official Action mailed October 4, 2007, the presently claimed embodiments of the invention were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 112 and 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Each of these rejections is addressed in turn below.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. More specifically, the Examiner noted that the limitation of “generating the medical reference book on the desired topic” was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2-10 as dependent on Claim 1.